

---

**Meeting Location:**

Terra Conference Room  
Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE)  
1800 Washington Blvd, Baltimore, MD 21230

---

**Notes:**

- **Agenda**
    - Review of October 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes
    - Update on GIS Subject Matter Stat – Rescheduled
    - Technical Committee Strategic Planning – Critical Next Steps
      - Memorandum of Understanding (see attached Draft)
      - Outreach and Education of Additional Partners
      - Framework Layer Working Groups (existing and proposed)
    - Other Business
    - Next Steps / Action Items
- 

Actual Meeting Start Time

-1:07 PM-

- **TOPIC #1: Review of October 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes**
  - *Send updates to Graham Petto.*
  - (NEW) SUB-TOPIC 1: Review of October 28, 2009 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes
    - “But some of the local governments are confused about whether or not Kenny really is the GIO.” (Page 5)
      - Doug Adams noted that local governments do not question that Kenny is the GIO. They only question what authority he has in this position.
        - *Executive Committee Meeting Minutes were updated and resent to Graham and Doug.*
- **TOPIC #2: Update on GIS Subject Matter Stat – Rescheduled**
  - Graham noted that even though the GIS Stat meeting with the Governor was cancelled shortly before the meeting, the meeting will be rescheduled so that the content was generated can be presented.
    - Graham noted that he will distribute the latest list of Action Items from the Governor’s Office. (??)
- **TOPIC #3: Technical Committee Strategic Planning – Critical Next Steps**
  - **SUB-TOPIC 1: Memorandum of Understanding (1:21 PM)**

- 
- Doug Adams noted that the MOU should be updated based on previous items that were originally tabled due to time constraints.
  - Graham noted that the current version of the MOU was authored quickly in order to give the Governor something to look at for the original GIS Stat meeting.
    - It was further noted that now that the GIS Stat meeting has been scheduled, the Technical Committee needs to continue to rework this document so that it is that much more prepared / updated for the next GIS Stat meeting.
  - (Doug) Is this meant to be an all-inclusive agreement between the “Partnership”?
    - (Doug) Is this going to cover sharing data between various Counties?
      - MDP noted that it only covers an agreement between counties and the State and not counties and cities, etc.
        - (Doug) The counties would like to see it cover more than just the data sharing agreement between counties and the State.
  - (Doug) Distribution of Spatial Data
    - (Doug) Will there be a portal (FTP) for distributing spatial data?
      - This needs to be a public access portal to enable counties to access data from other counties.
  - Method / Mechanism to Protect Data
    - (Doug) Some counties will allow for their data to be stood up in “READ-ONLY” format and not download-able.
      - (Doug) Will there be credentials for downloading data through this mechanism?
        - *This needs to be established in order to track who is downloading what and (possibly) why.*
          - *This will help to track “return on investment.”*
  - Under Purpose and Scope
    - (Doug) Add in a comma.
  - Executive Order (first paragraph)
    - (Doug) What is this Executive Order?
      - (Doug) This is the Executive Order that defines the GIO.
  - Introduction and Background
    - (Doug) Remove text specifying exact bodies that have been involved.
  - Term and Effective Date
    - (Doug) Why do we have a termination date?
      - This should be removed so that if people really want to get out of this MOU, they will need to file specific documentation specifying so.
-

- MDP noted that this date was put in place in order to allow for people to come back and re-evaluate their role at the termination date.
    - Doug went on to reiterate his above comments.
- Data Sharing Standards and Rights
  - Mutual Aide Agreements
    - Doug asked MEMA if this Agreement was all-encompassing.
      - This is more of partnership, rather than between the cities and State, etc.
  - Page 2
    - “time to time” wording needs to be updated and made more professional.
- Partner Responsibilities
  - (Doug) “They can get what they need for their projects.”
    - The counties want to stop working on data so that other entities can come in and use it without giving something back; i.e., they want to stop doing “their laundry”.
- State Responsibilities
  - (Doug) It’s one thing for the State to get counties data, but what about the other way around?
    - For example
      - Critical Area
      - Forest Conservation
- Data Submission Policy
  - (Doug) Is the Services Policy going to be added in?
    - MDP responded in the affirmative.
- SUB-TOPIC 2: Outreach and Education of Additional Partners
  - (MDP) Documents can be distributed to people that are not involved directly within the MD iMap Technical Committee, but with the caveat that the documents that are distributed MUST be noted as being in DRAFT form.
  - Graham noted that we need to work more actively to get more participation from other agencies in order to document the needs across the board for iMap.
    - We had originally talked about formulating a group to handle this. We need to reenergize this effort.
      - How should this occur?
        - (Doug) Noted that a working group still needs to be formulated in order to establish a business plan.
          - On the MSGIC page – MD iMap Section
            - Every time we have a meeting, those minutes need to be posted and the

MSGIC membership needs to be notified.

- Brooks needs to follow-up with Kenny Miller in order to get an official approval for working on the Outreach Subcommittee.
- Brooks also needs to send out (in PDF format) the latest version of the MD iMap Microsoft Project file in order to get feedback from the MD iMap Technical Committee.
- Graham asked about the MD iMap resource website that has been generated by DNR.
  - Doug noted that another website is linked to this website.
- Graham noted that we need to continue to promote additional membership because the MD iMap Technical Committee meeting is an open meeting.
  - This can occur by engaging others; i.e., word-of-mouth, emails, etc.
    - Doug noted that an open-ended, written letter of invitation should be sent out to anyone.
      - A timed agenda needs to be attached to this letter in order to inform those that want to attend when certain content will be covered.
- Brooks needs to follow-up Lisa Lowe (DNR) in order to get the approved minutes uploaded to the website.
  - <http://www.msgic.state.md.us/projects.asp>
  - Need to generate a standard email that is sent out to the delegation informing them of the posting of the minutes.
- Each State Agency will need to take the lead on their respective layers.
  - For Example:
    - MDE
      - Master Water Plan
      - Master Sewer Plan
    - SHA
      - Master Road Centerline Layer
- SUB-TOPIC 3: Framework Layer Working Groups (1:58 PM)
  - Municipalities are in charge of 157 of our boundaries, so they MUST be included.
    - Municipalities approve annexations.
      - *There isn't a house / senate bill that needs to be passed to make things happen.*

- Larry Swift (former mapping chief of SHA) was referenced as being a key player in the historical knowledge of this boundary situation.
- Working groups *have not* had real interaction between the counties and State.
  - *Doug noted that Mike Baxter (SHA) will support one road centerline for the State.*
- Framework Working Groups that do not currently exist:
  - Hydrology
    - MDE needs to engage the counties in order to acquire a 40, 100, 200 or 400 – scale hydrology layer.
  - Elevation
  - Geodetic Control
    - This would be an SHA – controlled group with outreach to the Surveying community.
- Doug noted that various (approx. 75) Geodatabases have been developed for the Community so that they can (possibly) become the standard.
- Next to the single, master road centerline for the State, the most important layer should be the Boundary layer because A LOT of other datasets are dependent on this dataset; i.e., parcels, road centerlines, etc.
- **Each Working Group has a responsibility for posting a MONTHLY STATUS REPORT to the MD iMap website.**
- The Applications Sub-Committee needs to be working because they need to be documenting and accumulating information because Cost Estimates must be generated in order to forecast what funds are needed to continue to support iMap.
  - *Doug referenced Kaushik Dutta as the key contact.*
  - Graham noted that the Governor has voiced the need to launch various applications in the iMap framework.
    - We (MD iMap Technical Committee) needs to follow-up with these applications to make sure that these applications / website conform to the MD iMap Framework.
      - The GIO will need to send out a letter to these entities that are publishing these applications / websites in order to make sure that the look-and-feel remains the same.
        - Lindsay Major is the spokesperson for the Governor's Office.
- TOPIC #4: Other Business – Review the GIS Stat PowerPoint
  - MDP noted that the “entire” meeting was supposed to be 1-hour.
    - But in the future, the next meeting will be more than 1-hour (possibly).
  - All Slides
    - The entire presentation needs to be “MD” iMap and not just “iMap”.

- Each slide needs to have a *Narrative* behind it so that anyone who views this document digitally (on a computer, Blackberry, etc) can re-cap what was covered.
- A comment was made that said that the “bulleted – approach” needs to be followed throughout the presentation in order to alleviate the illusion of “rank”.
- All statistics that are represented within the presentation need to be consistently throughout.
- Slide 3
  - 21<sup>st</sup> Century GIS leadership model
    - What does this mean?
      - It was noted that this was worded this way because during the initial part of the presentation, this wording was used to focus on the “this is where we want to go” – type of approach.
  - “America’s best mapping tool”
    - This wording needs to be updated because it sounds like we are campaigning for iMap (or something along those lines).
    - *MEMA needs to be able to support itself and it needs to support itself with its own internal staff and system.*
      - *MEMA wants to have its own database and application.*
        - *MEMA doesn’t want to have access to the entire MD iMap framework of datasets. They only want to have access to their core datasets.*
- A lot of the initial slides focus more on the negative, where they need to focus more on the positive; i.e., what are the hurdles, what are the actions to get over those hurdles, etc.
- Slide 5 – Actions to be Taken Now
  - There needs to be a slide devoted to “Next Generation” funding; i.e., funding through grants, etc.
- Slide 6 – Potential Actions for Governor O’Malley
  - “Help sell” needs to be updated to wording that is more direct.
  - “GIS Subcabinet”
    - Isn’t this the MD iMap Executive Committee??
      - *This is being discussed between the Governor’s Office, DOIT and DNR (Kenny).*
- Slide 8 – MD iMap Is... & Slide 9 – 3 Core Elements of MD iMap
  - Move the pyramid graphic from Slide 9 to Slide 8.
    - Also, update the graphic to include “Governance”; i.e., put a circle around the pyramid that is labeled “Governance”.
      - *In general, make the text in the pyramid graphic be the same as the text on Slide 8 and vice versa.*
- Slide 12 – MD iMap Existing Governance

- There is order, but it could be improved (*which is what this slide is illustrating*).
    - Update “DEW BERRY” to be “DEWBERRY”.
    - This slide is proposing that Kenny (GIO) is managed by a Cabinet, and this shouldn’t be the case.
    - This slide also does not include individual counties, cities, municipalities, etc.
  - Slide 16
    - Change “work flow” to “business processes”.
  - Slide 18
    - “big challenge” should focus more on defining leadership.
    - Parcels should be noted as “Vector Parcels”.
      - Vector Parcels needs to be a consistent, cartographic base statewide.
  - Slide 19 & Slide 20
    - These slides need to have the “blue boxes” updated.
  - (NEW) Slide 29
    - Add-in a slide for “Derivative Data” that shows how various datasets are used to generate each other; i.e., when one dataset is created, another one is then based off of it, and so on.
      - A discussion ensued that focused on agencies to submit a geographic representation, along with Liber and Folio, for parcels, etc.
  - Slide 22
    - Why are we relying on the Numbers Board for funding MDProperty View?
    - “MDP acts as ‘Middle Man’ to make local maps compatible.”
      - *Need to remove this bullet.*
  - Slide 23
    - “Proactive...”
      - Update ‘pop’ to be ‘flash’.
  - Slide 24
    - Continuation of Slide 23.
      - *Mick from EMMA needs to clarify to Kenny what content is shown on these slides.*
        - *Mick noted that Kenny wanted to have this slide present because the Governor wanted a status for what it would take to migrate EMMA to a more Viper – like look-and-feel.*
    - Next Steps
      - Change “Demo” to “Provide a Demonstration”.
    - Licensing is up to date, but it needs to be migrated to the latest GIS licensing.
    - New hardware / servers need to be acquired.
  - Slide 27
    - It is VERY important to not have Kenny report to a committee. He will need to report to an individual in order to continue
- TOPIC #6: Next Steps / Action Items

- October 20, 2009 Meeting Minutes
  - Send updates to Graham Petto before COB on Friday, November 6, 2009.
- Brooks needs to follow-up with Kenny Miller in order to get an *official* approval for working (and Chairing) on the Outreach Subcommittee.
- Brooks also needs to send out (in PDF format) the latest version of the MD iMap Microsoft Project file in order to get feedback from the MD iMap Technical Committee.
- Brooks needs to follow-up Lisa Lowe (DNR) in order to get the approved minutes uploaded to the website.
  - Need to generate a standard email that is sent out to the delegation informing them of the posting of the minutes.
- Brooks will send out the latest version of the MD iMap Microsoft Project file to the MD iMap Technical Committee for review and comment once he has received updates from those individuals that have tasks within the Project file.
  - This Project file will be sent out to the Technical Committee before COB on Friday, November 6, 2009.

**-END MEETING-**